



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,876	10/26/2001	Mark Duchow	670715-90029	1765

26710 7590 08/09/2004

QUARLES & BRADY LLP
411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE
SUITE 2040
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497

EXAMINER

MYHRE, JAMES W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/682,876

Applicant(s)

DUCHOW, MARK

Examiner

James W Myhre

Art Unit

3622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W Myhre.

(3) _____.

(2) Michael J. McGovern.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 August 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: slides of websites

Claim(s) discussed: 67.

Identification of prior art discussed: Stewart et al (6,259,405) and Scroggie et al (6,185,541).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant Representative discussed the proposed amendment and how the claims differed from the cited references. Specifically discussed was the order in which the customer information was received and how the system selected the retailer and the incentive. The Examiner didn't believe that this items would render the claims non-obvious over the references, but would reconsider them when the official amendment is received..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Interview Summary Record

Applicant's attorney emphasized the following patentable differences between the claimed invention and the references Scroggie and Stewart. The references do not -- during an incentive voucher sequence -- use a website computer system to make a selection of a single reseller of a product, based on selection of the product and input of a postal address code by the user, in a manner in which the user is not aware of the website selecting between different possible resellers. In addition, the user must select a product and enter personal information and a zip code before the specific incentive is disclosed to the user in contrast to unsolicited advertising offers. In addition, the user does not enter pre-stored demographic data or otherwise choose the reseller. An Information Disclosure Statement was also filed.

Interview Summary Record

Applicant's attorney discussed the operation of certain embodiments of the Scroggie and the Stewart references by referring to www.wayport.com and www.supermarkets.com and screen shots taken from these sites in comparison with screen shots from a site practicing the present invention. An Information Disclosure Statement was submitted with further Stewart patents and the website materials. Applicant's attorney pointed out how the differences in operation were carried through to the claims submitted in a draft amendment and requested an indication of allowance of the claims.